Electronic 901 Working Group Minutes

Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2005
Time: 1:00–3:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, 2nd Floor, Room 2198
Advocate: Ellen Liberman

Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 10, 2005. Location RKL 1, Room 2198

Change Request Prototype Page: http://erawebdev.od.nih.gov/UI/e901/index.asp

Action Items

1. (Daniel Fox) Write a warning message informing the user that scores will be removed should they proceed with an IRG Deferral change
2. (Lana Diggs) Test the current functionality in the R&R module.
3. (Daniel Fox) Talk to ICO to determine whether or not IRG deferral and Council Deferral can be lumped together under IRG deferral.
4. (Daniel Fox) Enhance Web QT to allow for search on Deleted Applications. There will be a checkbox on the Web QT's Basic Query screen, which if clicked will show only deleted applications as a result of the search. There needs to be a Request History Action Item within the Action Drop Down box that will take users to the Track Requests Hitlist and show all requests performed on the Application. From the Track Requests, users will be able to further drill down on the Request Details to view the details of each request.

Review Action Items from Last Meeting

Lana began the meeting by quickly reviewing the action items from the last meeting:

1. Write up a description/definition for the new IRG/Review Chief Role – ***Lana stated that they are still working on this right now and will soon send out this definition via email for comments from the group.***
2. Create checkbox in User Admin to designate the individual who receives assignment of eRequests by default (as there can be more than one RL or IRG Chief). – ***Completed.***
3. Make group-suggested changes to the Validation for IRG/SRG/SEP Fields document. **– *This will be completed shortly, based on the minutes.***
4. Add a message to Council Date change warning users if they enter past council dates. **– *This will be incorporated soon.***
5. Create a document explaining the routing Approval Chains of all fields discussed by the group. ***– Daniel stated that he will have this document completed by the next meeting.***

Administrative Deferrals Business Rules

Based on the long and complicated discussion the group came up with the following resolution:

1. There will be the following Requests for Deferrals:

a) *Council Date (Retain Review Outcome).* There will be a new checkbox on the Request Form (only if application has scores) that when clicked (with a combination of Council Date change) will generate Council Change (Retain Review Outcome).

b) *IRG deferral.* This request will be generated when Application has been scored and there is a change in Council Date and/or Integrated Review Group (IRG) Fields and Retain Review Outcome check box is not checked.

c.) *Routing for Council Change (Retain Review Outcome):* Same as Council Change.

d.) *Routing for IRG Deferral:* If there is a Council Date change only, then the process is the same as a Council Change. If there is an IRG Change in addition to a Council (or IRG Change only), then the process is the same as an IRG Change Request. In this case, users need to be warned that the scores, summary statements, reviewers, and reviewer conflicts will be removed once the request is completed.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Write a warning message informing the user that scores will be removed should they proceed with an IRG Deferral Request

Action: (Lana Diggs) Test the current functionality in the R&R module.

Deferrals and Other Combinations of Assignment Requests

Daniel suggested that the group not discuss this subject until the first cut. The group agreed to wait.

Routing for Withdrawals, Deletes, Reinstates and Deferrals

Daniel asked if the routing approval chain should follow the same rules for that of the Council and IRG changes. The group agreed that the approval chains are the same, with gatekeepers as the IRG chiefs and Referral Liaisons (RL). The council-only change will just be the IRG chief and Department of Receipt and Referral (DRR) chief.

Withdrawals

The Program Officer (PO) will act like a gatekeeper. The Approval Chain will look like this:

Any user (except PI and SO) → PO → DRR Chief.

Reinstatements

Reinstatements will follow the same rules and approval chain as withdrawals.

Deletion

Deletions, which are only done in pre-review, are performed mostly by DRR chiefs, but can also be done by RLs. Because there is no way to truly query on deleted items, Daniel suggested a checkbox that, if checked, will “show deleted items.” within Web QT. Gerald Calderone then suggested that all withdrawals, deletions, and reinstatements include a dropdown box that displays who performed any specific action and for what reason. The group agreed that this was a good idea and also requested that there be a notification about the status of a given withdrawal, reinstatement, or deletion.

Actions: (Daniel Fox) Enhance Web QT to allow for search on Deleted Applications. There will be a checkbox on the Web QT's Basic Query screen, which if clicked will show only deleted applications as a result of the search. There needs to be a Request History Action Item within the Action Drop Down box that will take users to the Track Requests Hitlist and show all requests performed on the Application. From the Track Requests, users will be able to further drill down on the Request Details to view the details of each request.

Reports: Current DRR and Others

The following two topics show the current reports from Receipt and Referral. Both of these reports are available within the referral module.

I.) Change Request Processed by Applicant & Application Number, Grouped by Referral Officer/Assistant Chief

The group said that this first report is currently only performed by Referral Officers, not Assistant Chiefs. The group agrees that it should include the Assistant Chief. The report is basically a listing of all 901 requests by a Referral Officer's initial assignment. This does not actually identify the 901 transaction, but rather the movement of a particular 901. This is just for DRR. Even though there is already a track request option, this is still necessary, as it presents greater capacity to show a multitude of reports.

II.) Change Request Processed by Applicant & Application Number, IC Changes between Institutes or Involving a Specific IC; Original IC and Current IC

The group stated that this report was supposed to been made broadened access within the referral module, but this was never done. The group agreed that institutes will be very interested in this report if they are given access. Daniel told them that it will be expanded.

Daniel stated that Track Requests screen allow users to search by meeting, PI last name, request type, request status, submitted request date, who submitted the request, Common Account Number (CAN), Grant Number and IC. There is also a button that the user can click called *My Requests*, which will display everything submitted by that user or currently assigned to that user. Everyone who has an IMPAC II account can access this system. The group suggested that the "request status" search criterion include the following qualifications: submitted, initiated, accepted, rejected, completed or not-completed.

The following table illustrates the process as it exists now:

Status	Name	Action
PO Review	-	Accepted
RL Review (TO IC)	-	Accepted
RL Review (FROM IC)	-	Accepted
Initiated	-	Accepted

The user simply needs to enter either the status or the action in order to search for information about a certain request. The group also wants to see everything that has gone through one of the gatekeeper roles. Daniel will have a prepared draft of the above process at the next meeting. There will also be a further discussion about the generic rules of notifications.

Attendees

Calderone, Gerald	Diggs, Lana	Edwards, Michael
Fisher, Suzanne	Hagan, Ann	Liberman, Ellen
Melchior, Christine	Noronha, Jean	Paugh, Steven
Roberts, Luci	Stesney, Jo Ann	